IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.NARAYANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1775 of 2004

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 18/06/2004 in WP No. 9907 OF 2004 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

M.Santosh Pawan, S/o.Late M.Surender,
R/o.H.No.3-5-697, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad.

..... APPELLANT

AND

1. The Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad.
2. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Quthbullapur Mandal, Rangareddy Dist.
3.The Revenue Divisional Officer, R.R. East Division, Hyderabad.
4. Bh.Satyanarayna Raju, S/o.Venkata Narasimha Raju,
R/o.Greenpark Avenue, Jeedimetla village, Hyderabad.
5. K.B.S.Prasad, S/o.Satyanaryana,
R/o.Greenpark Avenue, Jeedimetla village, Hyderabad.
6. Smt. Boddapati Indira Devi, W/o.Ramachandra Rao,
R/o.Greenpark Avenue, Jeedimetla village, Hyderabad.
7. V.V.K.Prasad, S/o.Nageshwara Rao,
R/o.142, Rao & Raju Colony, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.
8. M.Ramesh, S/o.M.Venkat Swamy,
R/o.Himayathnagar, Hyderabad.
9. M.Sudhir, S/o.Late M.Venkat Swamy
R/o.Himayathnagar, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellant: Mr. V.HARI HARAN

Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3: GP FOR REVENUE

Counsel for Respondents 4 to 9 : None appeared.

The Court made the following :

ORAL JUDGMENT:

(per The Honourable Sri Devinder Gupta, the Chief Justice)

Appellant is the writ petitioner, and, is aggrieved by the order passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition, at the admission stage. The appellant, in fact, had challenged the order of the first respondent, which, in fact, had reversed the orders of Respondents 2 and 3. Without appending the copies of the orders passed by Respondents 2 and 3, the petitioner wanted the order of the first respondent to be set aside. In the absence of there being copies of the orders of respondents 2 and 3 on record, learned Single Judge, obviously, declined to interfere with the said order finding no fault. As a matter of fact, the grievance of the petitioner-appellant is that the orders of respondents 2 and 3 were in consonance with law, and, being legal, were not liable to be set aside by the first respondent.

Learned counsel for the appellant states that he may be permitted to place copies of the orders of the Mandal Revenue Officer and the Revenue Divisional Officer so as to make good his submissions. We are inclined to agree to such a request, and, it will be appropriate for the writ petitioner-appellant to file these documents before the learned Single Judge, and, on filing of the same, learned Single Judge may hear the writ petitioner-appellant on admission of the Writ Petition.

The Writ Appeal is allowed and the order impugned is set aside. The petitioner-appellant is directed to file additional documents and affidavit. Learned Single Judge will, thereafter, take-up the case for admission afresh. No costs.

_____

DEVINDER GUPTA, C.J.

25.11.2004.

_____

M.NARAYANA REDDY, J.

VR.

To

1. The Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad.
2. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Quthbullapur Mandal, Rangareddy Dist.
3.The Revenue Divisional Officer, R.R. East Division, Hyderabad.
4. Two CCs to Government Pleader for Revenue, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT).

5. Two CD copies.